IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

STRIKE 3 HOLDINGS, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 18-0868

GEORGE BORDLEY,

Defendant.

ORDER

AND NOW, this 19th day of March 2019, upon consideration of Defendant's Motion for Leave to File Instanter Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. No. 19), and Plaintiff's Response in Opposition to Defendant's Motion (Doc. No. 20), it is **ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion for Leave to File (Doc. No. 19) is **DENIED**.¹

Local Rule 7.1(c) provides that "[u]nless the Court directs otherwise, any party opposing [a] motion shall serve a brief in opposition together with an answer or other response that may be appropriate, within fourteen (14) days after service of the motion and supporting brief. In the absence of timely response, the motion may be granted as uncontested" On February 26, 2019, after waiting nearly one month for a response from Defendant, the Court granted the uncontested Motion to Compel and ordered Defendant to pay \$2,630.46 in costs related to hiring the four technicians. (Doc. No. 18.) The Court did not order Defendant to pay attorney's fees.

On March 13, 2019, fifteen days after the Court's Order granting the Motion to Compel, Defendant filed the instant Motion for Leave to File Instanter Motion for Reconsideration. (Doc. No. 19.) Local Rule 7.1 (g) provides that "[m]otions for reconsideration or reargument shall be served and filed within fourteen (14) days after the entry of the order concerned, other than those governed by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e)." Because Defendant failed to file a motion for reconsideration within the 14-day deadline imposed by Local Rule 7.1(g), and

On January 31, 2019, Plaintiff Strike 3 Holdings, LLC filed a Motion to Compel (Doc. No. 17), asking the Court to compel Defendant George Bordley to provide complete responses to certain discovery requests. Additionally, Plaintiff asked the Court to award (1) attorney's fees, and (2) costs related to hiring four technicians for a scheduled meeting that Defendant did not attend without advance notice to Plaintiff that he would not be there. (<u>Id.</u>) Defendant did not file a response to the Motion to Compel. Nor did he request additional time to do so.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Joel H. Slomsky JOEL H. SLOMSKY, J.

in light of the fact that Defendant failed to respond to the Motion to Compel as required by Local Rule 7.1(c), the Court will deny Defendant's Motion to for Leave to File Instanter Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. No. 19).